



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Yet in spite of their limitations, the influence of these two men has been great, Ruskin's probably greater than Carlyle's. St. George's Guild was a failure; Ruskin's fortune was wasted in a futile attempt to solve practically the problem of better living; yet steadily Ruskin's insistence that the life was more than meat and the body more than raiment has told. Mr. McKail thinks that "his influence has been, and continues to be, immense. It is perhaps greater, so far at least as England is concerned, than that of any other single thinker or teacher. His social doctrine was germinal; it colors the whole fabric of modern thought, and shapes the whole fabric of modern practice."

Professor Roe's book is a welcome addition to the growing mass of literature on these two great writers. He has arranged his material well, and has exhibited a proper sense of proportion and restraint. We know of no more illuminating study of these two Heralds of the New Day.

CLARK S. NORTHUP

Cornell University

---

*SVERRIS SAGA ETTER CODEX AM 327*, 4°. Utgjevi av Den Norske Historiske Kildeskriftkommission ved Gustav Indrebø. Christiania, 1920, Pp. LXXVIII+214.

The Arnarnagnæan codex 327 of the Saga of King Sverre is a parchment Ms. of 92 leaves written about the year 1300. It is preserved almost complete, only a few pages being lacking, and is in excellent condition. A facsimile page of it was published in Kålund's *Palæografisk Atlas, Norsk-Islandske Afdeling*, 1905, as nr. 42, showing it to be a beautifully written manuscript with not a few interesting palæographic features. The original must have been composed ca. 1185, but that is not in existence; there are four copies, however, of which the present is the oldest. The saga is also contained in the *Eirspennil* (AM 47), which was edited for the Kildeskriftkommission in 1916 by Professor Finnur Jónsson, and where the Sverris Saga is found pp. 255-438. The editor of the *Eirspennil* dates it the first quarter of the XIVth century (p. VII). The Sverris Saga is further found in the *Flat Island Book*, date ca. 1380, and finally in the *Skalholt Book* (AM 81 a, fol), as its first 64 leaves; the date of the latter is given by Kålund as the XVth century. Both of these have also been published, the last in a critical edition for the Kildeskriftkommission in 1910.<sup>1</sup> In connection with the present edition I take occasion to note the fact that this Commission for the publication of documents that are in the

<sup>1</sup> The Flat Island Book was edited by G. Vigfusson and C. R. Unger in 1858-1868.

nature of original sources for Norwegian history now has to its credit a stately series of forty-six volumes. It is a series that no Scandinavian or historical collection can afford to be without.

The present edition is a careful and scholarly piece of editing, and a very important and welcome contribution, both as to the manner of editing and as to the critical Introduction with which it is supplied. In the matter of the printing the text there is only one point that I could have wished otherwise, namely in the printing of proper names. In the codex these are written variously with a minuscule, a small capital, or a large capital. The editor has used the large capital everywhere for the initial of names of persons, dialect regions, cities, and countries. This makes a more attractive and more readable page, and for most purposes fills every requirement; but for certain kinds of palæographic studies it is not as serviceable, as if it had showed also in this respect the exact condition of the Ms. However, I do not wish to cavil about this. The simplifications in type adopted seem justifiable; they are the two types of *r* and *r*. The latter is used everywhere in the edition; there seems no objection to this since we are informed that the type *r* is used after *o*, *b*, *d* and *ð*, otherwise *r* is used (we infer "everywhere otherwise"). Anglo-Saxon *ƿ* and Latin *v* are both written *v* in the edition; the editor notes that they are employed without any rule in the Ms., but *v* most in the beginning; toward the end of the Ms. *v* disappears and *ƿ* is used almost exclusively. Apparently, therefore, there is no system, or survival of a system, about the use of the *v* in the beginning of the Ms. The universal Anglo-Saxon *f* and the round *ð* of the Ms. are printed *f* and *d* in the edition. The scope of abbreviations is seen by the use of italics for abbreviated parts of words. The editor has thought best to set the prepositions *i* and *a* apart from the following word, though they are in the Ms. very often written combined with them. In the Ms. also the parts of compounds are commonly written apart, with full or half intervening space. In such cases the edition prints with a hyphen, I am glad to see. There are naturally many cases where it is difficult to decide whether the writer has intended separation of the elements of a compound or not; it is in fact sometimes impossible to say. The editor's method here has been one that seems the safest to follow (set out fully on pages XII-XIII). In passing I will here mention the fact that the tall *f* is also sometimes used for double *s* in the Ms; ligatures are very rare: *a+n* a couple times, *l+l*, twice, and *a+r* apparently only once.

In the Introduction the editor discusses the early history of the Ms., its orthography (pp. XV-XXXI), and with some detail the results of much investigation on the relation between

*AM* 327, 4° and the other Mss. of the Sverre Saga (pp. XXXI-LXXVIII). Very little is known of the history of the Ms., but it seems likely that it has never been in Iceland. There is some evidence that it was in Norway in the XIVth century, and it is known that it was in Bergen in the end of the XVIIth century. The excellent state of preservation of the codex seems to show that it had always been in Norway, until in 1708 Arne Magnussen brought it with him to Copenhagen. The language of 327, 4° is Icelandic throughout, but with a considerable admixture of Norwegian elements; in general these are most in evidence in the early part of the Ms., but in the matter of distinction between *æ* and *ǣ* there are about as many toward the end as in the beginning. The question of the nationality of the writer therefore presents itself. Both Kålund and F. Jónsson hold that it was written in Norway by an Icelander. Indrebø leaves the question in abeyance, suggesting that it may either be the work of a Norwegian who wrote from an Icelandic original, and who especially in the early part of the work uses native forms sometimes, or that it is the work of an Icelander writing in Norway, or writing from a Norwegian original (XXIX), noting, also that Trondhjem features are especially frequent in the early part of the Ms. (XVII). It does not seem to me that the distribution of the Norwegian elements (as most numerous in the beginning) argues especially for a theory of a Norwegian scribe copying from an Icelandic original, as against a theory of an Icelandic scribe copying a Norwegian original. In the latter case, too, the Norwegian forms would be most likely to creep in in the early part of the Ms. But it seems to me that if the original had been Norwegian the Norwegian elements would have been more numerous than they are. And specifically if the original had been in the Trondhjem dialect of Norwegian the cases of absence of *u*-umlaut with retained *o*, would have asserted themselves more than they have (the editor lists only seven instances, of which six are pret. plurals of the type *leitaðu*). It would seem that orthography and phonology do not offer anything conclusive in this case. It is possible that a study of the palæography might.

The editor considers the question of the similarity of script as between *AM* 327 and *AM* 75 *e*, noted by Kålund.<sup>2</sup> But Indrebø shows that there are considerable orthographic differences, as well as some differences in scribal practice.

The question of the relations of the different Mss. practically becomes the question of whether the Eirspennil redaction is a later abbreviated version. This is the view of most who have expressed themselves on the subject. However, the two Norwegian scholars Yngvar Nielsen and Halvdan Koht hold the

<sup>2</sup> *Katalog over den arnamagnæanske Haandskriftsamling*, I, p. 55.

opinion that *AM* 327 is an expanded version and that Eirspennil stands nearer to the original. The evidence for the latter view of the Mss. is interestingly and very clearly set forth in an article entitled "Norsk Historieskrivning under Koht Sverre, Serskilt Sverresoga" in *Edda*, II, pp. 67-102. The problem is an exceedingly complicated one. The Eirspennil is characterized by that concise prose style that belongs to the classical age of saga writing; but in spite of that it may be one or several steps removed from the original; and somewhere in the process of copying a redactor has in this case decided to eliminate and abbreviate with a view to confining himself to the bare facts of a well rounded out story. But also *AM* 327 is in good classical style, in the main; the departures from that style are not sufficiently numerous to strike the reader. Nevertheless the latter does exhibit a not inconsiderable number, when actually counted, of those stylistic devices which are so characteristic of the post-classical period. But these may be the additions of the copyist of *AM* 327; so that this more complete Ms. form may stand close to the original, in spite of devices mentioned (such is e. g., *rekinn af þínu ríki eða af landi*). The editor illustrates these features with some detail; and while granting a closer relationship between Mss. 327, *AM* 81, and that of the Flat Island Book, as opposed to that of Eirspennil he shows also that in this very matter of stylistic parallels and other ornate elements *AM* 327 stands apart from the other three. Hence the evidence of the form of personal names or place-names, the geographical information sometimes given, the omission of facts in one or the other Ms., or errors of facts, lead the editor to a grouping of the Mss. according to which the three above Mss. belong together in one group as far as contents is concerned and that the purified text that can be derived from these shows a form of the saga that is more original than the Eirspennil text; the latter exhibits abbreviation of the original at the expense of style, but also often at the expense of contents. Ms. *AM* 327 is a copy of a copy (*A*<sup>1</sup>) of the original, and that of the Flat Island Book is a copy of another copy (*B*) of the original, but embodies also elements from *A*<sup>1</sup>. Mss. *AM* 81 and of Eirspennil belong together as copies two steps removed from *B*.

As to the scope of Karl Jonsson's authorship in the saga, whether he wrote all or only the first part, and if the latter, then just where his work stops, I suppose only a linguistic investigation of the whole saga is likely to give tangible results. The editor considers the problem, partly from the standpoint of alliterations, rimes, etc., but more fully with reference to contents, such as the tendency or party interest shown in the different portions of the saga. Viewing all the evidence considered the editor seems inclined to hold to duality of author-

ship, and chapter 43 as the closing chapter of the work of the first writer.

GEORGE T. FLOM

---

*PTOLEMY'S MAPS OF NORTHERN EUROPE. A Reconstruction of the Prototypes.* By Gudmund Schütte. Published by the Royal Danish Geographical Society. Copenhagen. H. Hagerup. (1917).

Recognizing how far the study of Ptolemy's *Geography* has lagged behind that of the other great early source of our knowledge of Northern Europe, Tacitus' *Germania*, the author makes some of his researches accessible to scholars in the form of this provisional study. It was finished just after the outbreak of the war, when it was no longer possible to visit important libraries outside of Denmark.

Disregarding for the present the very difficult textual matters, the author limits this study to the cartographic problem of Ptolemy's lost prototypes, and simplifies his work still further by basing it on the recently discovered Vatican MS. (Urbinius 82) of the Ptolemaic atlas. This MS. dates from about 1200 A.D. and belongs to the group which have an atlas of twenty-seven maps. An edition of this codex has been promised by Prof. Jos. Fischer S. J., who placed much of his material at the disposal of Dr. Schütte. The author follows Fischer in supporting the theory that the better MS. atlases are true continuations of Ptolemy's work and represent the maps as they were designed by Marinus of Tyre, the second century geographer to whom Ptolemy owed much. The atlases may contain the more correct spelling or give entire names which are left out in the text. It is a serious fault in method to ignore the atlases, as the scholars who worked on the MSS. had done. The atlases are fully as old as the manuscript texts they accompany and certainly afford better evidence than fifteenth or sixteenth century printed editions of the latter which editors had sometimes preferred. Corruptions which could have been amended by consideration of the atlas readings had often been ascribed to Ptolemy (p. 8).

In introductory sections Dr. Schütte gives a brief survey of the manuscript problem; discussions of Ptolemy's predecessors, especially Marinus; of Ptolemy himself and his critical principles, and of Ptolemy's successors, continuing with such topics as misreadings of Latin forms, barbarian names, fictitious repetitions (partly due to the inability of Marinus to recognize the identity of barbarian names when he found them in somewhat varying orthography), etc. Then the author takes up the study of fourteen Ptolemaic prototypes assumed by him,